MANU, UTNAPISHTIM, DEUCALION, AND NOAH: THEOLOGICAL INTERPRETATION OF REVELATION AND SALVATION IN THE GREAT FLOOD

By: Jayanantaka

Abstract

The phenomenon *of the great flood* story that is spread across almost all of the world's civilizations represents humanity's cosmic memory of destruction and rescue. Narratives of saviors—such as Manu in the Vedic tradition, Utnapishtim in *the Epic of Gilgamesh*, Deucalion in Greek mythology, and Nūḥ (Noah) in the Semitic tradition—exhibit a universal pattern that points to a single structure of meaning: the relationship between water, revelation, and moral order. This article departs from the theological assumption that all of these figures are local representations of the same divine messenger, with a narrative that adapts to the geographical and socio-cultural context of each society.

Through an anthropological approach, this study explores the symbolic function of water as a medium of regeneration of the cosmos and a means of communication between humans and the sacred. Meanwhile, with a post-structuralist approach, the story of the flood is read as a text that is constantly undergoing *re-writing* in accordance with changes in the discourse of power and the system of meaning that surrounds it. Comparative analysis shows that the flood myth underwent a transformation from a cosmological-ritual form (in the Indian and Mesopotamian traditions) to an ethical-prophetic form (in the Greek and Semitic traditions).

The findings of this study confirm that the story of the great flood is not just a myth about the destruction of the world, but a form of universal revelation that contains a moral and spiritual message across religions. The water in this narrative serves as a symbol of self-purification and the rebirth of civilization, while the savior figure serves as a mirror for human awareness of the origin and purpose of his life. Thus, the great flood can be understood as *a divine text* that continues to speak through different cultural languages, but leads to one meaning: the oneness of God and the salvation of man.

Keywords: Great flood, universal revelation, religious anthropology, post-structuralism, savior figures, Manu, Noah.

Introduction

The story of the great flood and a savior of mankind is one of the most universal archetypes in the religious history of mankind. From the Euphrates valley to the Ganges, from the Caucasus mountains to the Greek plains, the same theme continues to emerge with a variety of different languages, gods and symbols. In Vedic India this story lives through the figure **of Manu** in *the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*; in Mesopotamia, through **Ziusudra** in *the Eridu Genesis* and **Utnapishtim** in *the Epic of Gilgamesh*; in the Greek world through **Deucalion**; and in the Semitic tradition through **Noah (Nūḥ)** as recorded in *the Book of Genesis* and *the Qur'an*.

For researchers of comparative mythology, the striking similarities between all these versions have long been subject to debate—whether the story is a spread from a single ancient source, the result of the collective experience of a major geological disaster, or the symbolic manifestation of the same spiritual structure in human consciousness. However, in a monotheistic theological context, these stories can also be read as evidence that Divine revelation has greeted all of humanity with a language

and form that corresponds to their respective cultural spaces. It is within this framework that figures such as Manu, Ziusudra, Utnapishtim, Deucalion, and Noah can be understood not as separate figures, but as local manifestations of **the one messenger of God**, the messenger of purification, salvation, and the renewal of life after human tyranny has transcended the limits.

The approach used in this paper combines **religious anthropology** and **post-structuralism**. Anthropological approaches are used to trace how symbols such as *water*, *arks*, and *seeds of life* function in the system of meaning and rites of each society. Water in almost all cultures has an ambivalent meaning—it kills as well as purifys, destroys and rebirths. In the flood stories, water becomes a divine medium to reorganize the cosmos, remove moral or spiritual chaos, and give birth to a new world.

While the post-structuralist approach helps to read how **the divine narratives are shaped, arranged, and interpreted** by society according to the symbolic and political needs of their respective cultural spaces. To borrow Roland Barthes' term, every religious text is *a myth* in a positive sense—a system of signs that establishes language and rite. Through the myth of the flood, each civilization reaffirms the relationship between man and the Transcendent, and restructures the legitimacy of its moral and social power.

The story of Manu in *the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, for example, presents a savior figure in a **cosmological context**. Manu is not a moral prophet or an ethical reformer, but a guardian of the order of creation (ṛta) threatened by the return of chaos. Water in the Vedic version is not a punishment, but rather a cosmic element that marks the cycle of creation and dissolution (saṃsāra). So the flood is not a catastrophe, but a process of regeneration of the world; and Manu became a surviving figure because he maintained the harmony of rites and the laws of nature.

In contrast, in the texts *of Eridu Genesis* and *the Epic of Gilgamesh*, the characters **of Ziusudra** and **Utnapishtim** appear in the midst of a polytheistic system that began to experience the decentralization of divine meaning. When the gods decide to destroy humanity, there appears a single figure chosen and saved by a singular and mysterious divine voice—Enki or Ea. At this point there began to be **a movement towards latent monotheism**, for salvation was no longer the result of the collective decision of the gods, but the result of love or warning from one supreme power. Anthropologically, this narrative reflects a shift from an agrarian ritual society to an early urban society that recognized a single authority, both in politics and theology.

In the Greek tradition, the figure of **Deucalion** brought about a further shift: the great flood was now a moral consequence. The god Zeus punishes humans for their tyranny and moral deviance. Water is no longer an element of the cosmos, but a means of ethical redemption. The couple Deucalion and Pyrrha reorganize humanity through moral action—throwing stones that become new humans. Thus, this Greek story shows the transformation of the flood myth into **a tool of moral legitimacy**, marking a time when society began to seek a universal ethical basis beyond mere ritual.

The culmination of all these transformations is seen in the story **of the Prophet Noah** in the Semitic tradition, especially in *the Qur'an*. This narrative confirms that the flood was a **singular act of God**, not a cosmic phenomenon or conflict between gods. Noah was not only a man who was saved, but a messenger who was sent to warn, preach, and save those who believed. Floods are a symbol of da'wah, not just a purification of nature. In this context, the savior figure is transformed into a bearer of moral treatises and monotheism.

Anthropological comparisons show that the change in the meaning of the savior figure from Manu to Noah went hand in hand with the evolution of human social structure. In the highly ritualistic early

Vedic societies, salvation was cosmic; in Mesopotamian urban societies, rescue is existential; in Greek society, it was moral; and in Semitic societies, it is prophetic and transcendental. In other words, **the functions of water and the ark change according to cultural needs**: from the elements of the cosmos → means of life → moral tools → divine revelation.

The post-structuralist approach sees this process as **a game of signs and** meanings (*jeu de signifiants*) that constantly moves between linguistic and religious systems. Manu, Ziusudra, Utnapishtim, Deucalion, and Noah are just the different names of one universal savior archetype—figures who maintain the Divine order in a local form. When Islam came into existence with the concept of universal apostolate, the figure found its final form in the Prophet Muhammad صلى الله عليه وسلم, who affirmed that every ummah had its apostle (Q.S. Fāṭir [35]:24), and that the story of Noah was only one of the series of revelations that shaped the spiritual history of mankind.

Thus, this study does not simply compare the story of the flood from various sources, but seeks to read the **symbolic structure of universal revelation** articulated through diverse cultural languages. The flood myth, in this view, is a cosmic text rewritten in the dialect of every nation—a sign that the Divine message is always in tune with the anthropological context of man.

Part II – Manu in Vedic Texts: Cosmology, Water, and the Regeneration of the World

The story of the great flood in the Vedic Indian tradition is first found in its entirety in *the Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* (I.8.1.7–10), part of the *Śrauta ritual corpus* that serves as the theological explanation of the *Yajurveda*. In contrast to post-Vedic epics such as *the Mahābhārata* or *Purāṇa* that depicted figures of gods, *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* still operates within the framework of ritual theology, in which the structure of the cosmos is maintained through liturgical action. In this context, **Manu's story** is not just a moral myth, but a cosmological formula that affirms the relationship between man, water, and creation.

The text begins with a very simple but meaningful narrative: while Manu is washing his hands, a fish appears and begs for protection from him. The fish warned that a *pralaya* — a cosmic flood marking the end of a world cycle — was coming. He asks Manu to take care of him to his full-size, and in return, the fish will save him from destruction.

Atha Manur Āpa Upaspṛśamāna Udakaṃ Gṛhītavān | Tasya Hastāt Matsyaḥ Sambabhūva... By Hassan | rakṣasva māṃ tvāṃ samṛddhim anu dāsyāmīti |
(Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa I.8.1.7)

In this narrative, the symbolism of water appears on two levels. First, water is an element of ritual cleansing (upaspṛśamāna), a common act in the context of yajña; Second, water is the medium of revelation of cosmic revelation. Fish (matsya) arises not from the sky or the mountains, but from the water offering itself—signifying that revelation in the Vedic view is not an external command from a transcendent God, but a manifestation of the immanent divine principle within the elements of the cosmos.

From the perspective of **religious anthropology**, water here occupies the function that Mircea Eliade calls the *axis of regeneration*, which is the center where the world is reborn after destruction. When the fish warns Manu of the *coming of pralaya*, what is actually being revealed is not a geological event, but a sacred process of the recreation of the world. Manu was saved because he was able to maintain the ritual order — he did not abandon the act of purification even in the midst of the threat of destruction. Thus, salvation in the Vedic tradition is not the result of faith or morality as in the Semitic

tradition, but rather of attachment to *ṛta*, the law of the cosmos that must be guarded so that the world does not sink into chaos (*anṛta*).

When the great flood arrived, the fish—which in mythology was later identified as a manifestation of Viṣṇu—pulled Manu's ark to the top of the northern mountain. After the tide had receded, Manu offered sacrifices to the gods, and from that offering arose a divine woman from whom a new humanity was born. This process affirms the concept of biological and spiritual regeneration through rites, not through da'wah or morality. Manu, thus, is the *human prājāpati*—the second creator after God.

In **a post-structuralist context**, the text can be read as a mechanism of meaning-creation through the binary opposition between *ṛta–anṛta*, *water–soil*, and *human–god*. Floods serve as "*erasers of signs*," which nullify the entire old system so that new meanings can emerge. When the old world dissolves in water, the old language and symbolic order are destroyed. All that remains are Manu and the ark — the central symbol of the new meaning. This is where *the function of the ark* is no longer just physical, but semiotic: it is a *language space* where knowledge and rites survive during the destruction of the world.

Jacques Derrida once said that every text always bears traces of vanished meaning; so the story of Manu keeps traces of the previous system. Water is not only a symbol of creation, but also *the erasure of the old cosmos text*. From there, a new text emerged—a new world—rewritten by Manu's ritual acts. Thus, this story is not just a story of biological salvation, but an allegory about the regeneration of meaning in the order of the universe.

In the social system of Vedic society, this meaning has a strong resonance. Manu is a name that would later become a symbol of law and social order — as seen in *the Manusmṛti*, where Manu appears as the lawmaker of man. This shows the continuity of function: the cosmic savior figure transforms into a social order builder. Anthropologist Victor Turner calls this process the *ritualization of myth* — a cosmic myth that is relegated to a social structure. Water which was once a symbol of universal regeneration is now a symbol of caste purity, and the act of purification (snāna) performed by Manu is transformed into a social ritual that governs the life of Brahmins and non-Brahmins.

Interestingly, in this story there is no moral element in the sense of personal ethics. Manu was not chosen because of his kindness, but because of *his knowledge* of the rites. He is a figure who *knows when and how* to perform purification, not a figure who preaches the truth. This is different from the Prophet Noah in the Qur'an whose main task was to preach, not to maintain the rites. So it can be said that in the Vedic phase, revelation is still cosmological—not ethical. The ones who are saved are not "righteous ones," but "guardians of order."

However, behind the ritualism lay the seeds of early monotheism. The fish that helped Manu said: *"I will protect you, as you protect me."* This relationship is not a magical contract between man and god, but rather a reflection of a universal law of moral reciprocity: protection gives birth to protection. In the Islamic tradition, the same principle is affirmed in the hadith qudsi: *"Whoever helps My servant, I will help him."* Thus, this Vedic text preserves a latent ethical structure that would fully develop in the later prophetic tradition.

In the post-structuralist horizon, it can be said that the figure of Manu is the *original signifiant* — the original marker of the savior human archetype. He does not have a "message" in the verbal sense, but his actions form a space of meaning for subsequent narratives. When similar stories appear in the Mesopotamian and Greek traditions, each simply rewrites Manu's footprints in a different language

and power. Manu became the prototype of man who was in direct contact with divine forces through nature, not through written law.

Thus, Manu represents the first stage of human spiritual evolution: **the cosmology-ritual** stage, in which salvation is not understood as penance, but as the guardian of the universe balance. When the great flood hit, what was preserved was not faith, but life itself—seeds, animals, water, and fire. Manu becomes a symbol of man who negotiates salvation not through belief, but through the order of action.

Within the grand framework of this study, Manu's story is the initial foundation of the universal structure of the flood myth. He describes how the collective experience of the destruction of the world is articulated in the language of rites and the cosmos. Only in the later stages will the structure shift towards a moral (Deucalion) and prophetic (Noah) orientation. Yet its monotheistic roots are already implicit in the sacred relationship between man, nature, and the single force that protects both.

💙 Part III – Ziusudra in the Sumerian Texts: The Flood, the Silence, and the Birth of Existential Ethics

1. Historical Context and Original Text

The story of the great flood in the oldest Sumerian tradition is found in a fragment of a manuscript known as **the "Eridu Genesis"** (sometimes also called *the Sumerian Flood Story*), dating from around the 17th century BC, long before the Babylonian version *of the Gilgamesh Epic*. This text was written in cuneiform script on a tablet found at Nippur and is preserved today in the *University of Pennsylvania Museum*.

The relevant fragment reads (transliteration and literal translation):

Sumerian text (transliteration):
zi-ud-sud-ra lugal... kiur-ra
nam-lu-lu-ge-de3 dšul-gi nam-lu-lu-ge-de3...
en-ki-ke4 in-na-ab-du11 kiur-ra ba-an-da-gub
en-ki-ke4 in-na-ab-du11 a-ma-ru šu ba-an-ti
a-ma-ru ba-an-ti ĝeš-ma2 ba-an-gi4-a
zi-ud-sud-ra gišma2-ĝu10-ta in-da-ab-du11
a-ma-ru kiĝ2-ĝu10-ta ba-an-ti

Ziusudra, the king (or priest) of the city of Šuruppak, stood before Enki.Enki spoke to him: 'A flood is coming to annihilate mankind.'Enki ordered him to build a great ark out of wood. Ziusudra obeyed the order. When the flood came, the storm swept the earth. In his ark, Ziusudra took refuge with the life he led.'"

After the tide recedeed, Ziusudra offered sacrifices to the gods, and in return, he was granted "eternal life" and placed in the land of *Dilmun* (eastern heaven).

---

2. Anthropological Analysis: From the Cosmos to Ethics

If in *Manu's story the* flood marks the regeneration of the cosmos, then in *Ziusudra's* story the flood marks a **crisis of social morality**. The Sumerian narrative emerged in the early context of the *city-state* formation in Mesopotamia, where the social order began to be governed by kings and priests, no longer by universal rites. Thus the gods here act not as symbols of nature (such as water or mountains), but as entities with moral and political will.

In the text it is stated:

"The gods, in the assembly, decided to exterminate humans."

The decision was born out of **human moral disorder** — they were noisy, corrupt, and no longer respected the ritual order. It reflects a change in social structure: from a sacred Vedic order based *on ṛta* to a legal and moral order based on a *council of gods*.

Ziusudra here is not a priest of the rite like Manu, but a **priest-king** —a mediator between the gods and the people. He survived not because he performed purification or ritual, but because he "heard the divine voice" (*in-na-ab-du11*). Here's a great anthropological shift: salvation now depends on **obedience to revelation**, not on the observance of cosmic rites.

In Sumerian society that began to recognize the bureaucratic structure and the written legal system, this narrative served as **a myth of the moral legitimacy of power**. A king who obeys a divine message is considered the sole guardian of the world's salvation. In this context, the story of Ziusudra becomes the archetype of the holy king—a figure who acts not only for himself, but for the salvation of all mankind.

---

3. Post-Structuralist Analysis: Silence and the Power of Sign

Semiotically, this story contains a very characteristic moment: **the revelation comes in silence**. Enki did not speak directly to Ziusudra publicly, but "whispered through the walls of the divine lodge" (*kiur-ra in-na-ab-du11*). In the Mesopotamian tradition, revelation through "walls" is a metaphor for hidden language— *a non-transparent* signifiant.

In the lens of post-structuralism (especially Derrida), this suggests that divine meaning is never directly present (*présence absolue*), but always through a medium — signs, walls, or text. Thus, Ziusudra was the first human to *interpret* revelation, not simply accept it. He reads signs, not just hears sounds.

This marked the transition from **symbolic cosmology to moral hermeneutics**. The world is no longer understood as a system that must be kept in balance, but rather as a text that must be read and interpreted. The flood, then, is a *crisis of meaning* —when moral signs are no longer understood, the world must be "cleansed" in order for sacred language to be rewritten.

After the tide recedes, Enki bestows Ziusudra on eternal life. But paradoxically, eternal life is not in the human world, but in *the paradise of Dilmun*. This means that the savior of man is now separated from man himself. This text creates **an ontological distance between the prophet and his people**, a pattern that would reappear in the Semitic tradition: the prophet as a witness, no longer part of his community after the rescue occurred.

---

4. Comparison with Manu and the Mythical Evolutionary Direction

Aspects	**Manu (Vedic India)**	**Ziusudra (Sumerian)**
Forms of Relationship with the Divine	Immanence (through water and rites)	Transcendent (through verbal revelation)

Aspects	Manu (Vedic India)	Ziusudra (Sumerian)
Safety Resources	Maintenance *of ṛta* (order of the cosmos)	Obedience to moral messages
Main Symbols	Water and the Ark as regeneration	The Wall and the Ark as a revelation
Final Results	The new world and the human race	Eternal life in heaven (Dilmun)
Reflective Social Structure	Brahmin (cosmological) rituals	The (theocratic) Kingdom-Priesthood

From an anthropological perspective, this change can be interpreted as a transition from **an agrarian-ritual society** to an **urban-bureaucratic society**. Water, once a symbol of the source of life, is now a tool of punishment. Manu "communicates with fish" (the natural world), while Ziusudra "hears the walls" (the city world). This transition signifies the birth of the realization that revelation is no longer present in the open air, but in closed social spaces—in texts, laws, and rituals of power.

---

5. Mythical Structure and Traces of Monotheism

Although the Sumerian text is polytheistic, the story of Ziusudra already contains an implicit monotheistic pattern: one god (Enki) opposes the decision of the assembly of other gods to save mankind. This is the early archetype of the **"one savior God"** that would develop in the Abrahamic tradition.

In *Eridu Genesis*, Enki appears as a figure who defies the will of the other gods because "he loves humans". He is not just a god of water, but a manifestation of compassion. In this sense, Enki is not just a mythological character, but a representation of a universal ethical principle—"which protects life against destructive powers."

Thus, *Ziusudra* can be read as the second stage of human spiritual evolution: **the theological-moral stage**, in which salvation is understood as a response to ethical revelation, no longer the balance of the cosmos.

---

6. Temporary Conclusion

The story of Ziusudra marks a shift from the cosmos to morality, from nature to text, from rite to revelation. If Manu is the figure who saves the world through order, then Ziusudra saves the world through understanding. Here, human consciousness begins to take shape that salvation is not a repetition of a cycle, but the result of *a correct interpretation of divine signs*.

In the universal narrative of the great flood, Manu represents the man who guards creation; Ziusudra represents the man who hears the word; and in the future, Noah will represent the people who call to faith.

Part IV – Utnapishtim in the Epic of Gilgamesh: Text, Memory, and Transcendence

1. Historical Context and Narrative Position

The story **of Utnapishtim** is a Babylonian version of the legend of the great flood that was previously known in the Sumerian tradition (Ziusudra). This version is contained in *the Epic of Gilgamesh*, tablet XI (c. 12th century BC, but copied an older tradition from about 1700 BC). The manuscript was written in Akkadian in cuneiform script and is found in the library of the king of Ashurbanipal, Nineveh (now in the British Museum).

In this epic, the character **of Gilgamesh**, the king of Uruk who searches for the secret of immortality, visits **Utnapishtim**, a human who was once saved from the great flood and given eternal life by the gods. Thus the story of the flood here comes as **a narrative within the narrative**, a *metatext* that recounts the experience of the first human to survive total destruction.

---

2. Original Text: Tablet XI, Lines 9–196

Here are the core quotes (transliteration and literal translation):

Akkadian (transliteration):
Ea piriš napšāti eliš illak ina rēmi
Utnapištim ina šubti illak
Ea uštēšir qibītšu ina qibīt bīti
šūt libbi bīti kīma šamê iškunšunūti
manû eliš illak
ina qibīt bīti ištēniš qibīssunu amnûti
šulmu ana šēpīka lušakkanu
Utnapištim ina bīti ilāni ēpišu

Ea (Enki) spoke to a man on the wall of his house,
saying: 'House of reeds, listen; walls, pay attention! O man of Šuruppak, son of Ubartutu, build a great ship.
Leave possessions, seek safety. Bring the seeds of all living things into the ark. The vessel should be of the specified size: the length and width are the same.
Cover it like the sky.'"

After that came the rain for **six days and seven nights**, the earth sank, the people were destroyed, and after the tide receded, the Utnapishtim ship was stranded on the top of **Mount Nisir**. He then released a dove, then a swallow, and finally a raven that did not return—a sign that the land had appeared.

ušēṣi uṣṣur ušēṣi summu ušēṣi arbu
ina ina šapliš imitti ana napši išaqqil arbu lā itur
("I let go of the pigeon, I let go of the swallow, I let go of the crow;
the crow went away and did not return.")

After getting out of the ship, Utnapishtim offered sacrifices to the gods:

ikalla ana ilāni ša qerēni ušēṣi
irši mīsu ana šamê ištēniš inaddišu
("I offer sacrifices to the gods. Sweet smoke fills the sky together.")

The gods sniffed the scent of the sacrifice, and **Ishtar wept**, lamenting the destruction of humanity. Then Enlil (the supreme god) finally blessed Utnapishtim and his wife with eternal life, placing them "at the end of the river", in the eternal realm.

3. Anthropological Analysis: Collective Memory and the Power of Ritual

In contrast to Ziusudra who is still theological, the story of Utnapishtim has entered **a complex anthropological-historical** stage . It emerged in a society that already had an established system of literacy, law, and royal power. Therefore, the story of the flood no longer serves as a ritual myth or moral revelation, but as a **myth of collective memory—a** cultural tool for interpreting the relationship between humans, time, and death.

In *the Epic of Gilgamesh*, Utnapishtim is no longer the central figure of salvation, but rather a **repository of** the memory of the old world. He is not a savior, but a witness. So when Gilgamesh met him, what he sought was not physical salvation, but the knowledge of "why man must die."

In Babylonian society, this myth served to **affirm the king's power** in a paradoxical way: the king became the most powerful man, but not immortal. Only Utnapishtim, who lives outside the world system, is immortal. This created a new ideological structure—the god as the giver of history, and the human as a reminder of divine suffering.

Anthropologically, the flood here represents a **moral crisis of power**: when humans aspire to become gods, the order must be destroyed. Thus, the ark is no longer a symbol of regeneration as in Manu, but a **historical archive** — a container that keeps the memory of the old world from disappearing.

---

4. Post-Structuralist Analysis: Text in Text and Repetition of Marks

Derrida called every great text on origins always "repeating the lost origin." *The epic of Gilgamesh* is a perfect example of this: the flood story not only repeats the story of Ziusudra, but also rewrites it as **a story about the writing itself**.

Notice how Ea did not speak directly to Utnapishtim, but through the *walls of the reed house*—a symbol of written language. Utnapishtim received revelation not through the ears, but through the text. He is no longer a ritual performer (like Manu), or a listener (like Ziusudra), but a **revelator**.

The ark he built was also "textual": it was symmetrical in size, tightly closed like a clay tablet that held writings. It is not a biological vessel, but an *arkheion* — a repository of meaning. Thus, Utnapishtim is the archetype of the human writer — the human being who saves the world through writing.

When he tells the story to Gilgamesh, the story becomes **a narrative within a narrative** — *the text recounting the making of a text*. Floods are not just natural events, but a metaphor for **the loss of meaning and the rewriting of the world**. Once the world is "erased," the only way for existence to survive is to rewrite it.

Therefore, the function of the flood myth here is to restore the language after symbolic destruction. If Manu rewrote the cosmos with rites, and Ziusudra rewrote morality with revelation, then Utnapishtim rewrote meaning with **narrative**.

---

5. Symbolism and Social Structure

Within the Babylonian social framework, Utnapishtim marked the **transition from religio-ritual to religio-literary**. The gods are no longer present in fire or water, but in writings and stories. This epic is the earliest evidence that myth has become a text, not just a rite.

The main symbols—walls, arks, and mountains—are all sign architecture. The wall is revelation, the ark is the archive, and the mountain is the pinnacle of the language on which the text is sanctified.

Socially, this myth serves to reinforce the position of the scribe (*šatammu*) and the priest as the guardian of knowledge. They are the "new Utnapishtim" who keep the sacred memory of the nation. Within the framework of Lévi-Strauss's structural anthropology, this story is a myth about **the transition of power from body to text** —from king to writer, from action to narrative.

---

6. Comparison with Manu and Ziusudra

Aspects	**Manu (India)**	**Ziusudra (Sumerian)**	**Utnapishtim (Babylon)**
Mediation with the Divine	Through nature and rites	Through moral revelation	Through text and language
The Meaning of Flood	Regeneration of the cosmos	Moral punishment	Removal of meaning and rewriting
Forms of Security	Living in a new world	Eternal life in heaven	Immortal in memory and text
Reflective Social Structure	Brahmins and rites	Priests and kings	Scribes and intellectuals
Theological Direction	Cosmological	Moral	Existential-literary

From this table it appears that the story of the flood does not stop as a myth of nature, but develops into an existential metaphor: man always tries to "save meaning" after destruction.

---

7. Conclusion: From the Cosmos to the Narrative

The story of Utnapishtim closes the "Oriental" phase of the myth of the great flood before entering the territory of the Semitic tradition. In this story, salvation is no longer the result of rite (Manu) or moral obedience (Ziusudra), but rather the result of *memory and text*. Utnapishtim was the first man to understand that the world can perish, but the meaning can endure—as far as it is written.

From here, therefore, the evolution of the flood narrative moves from **the cosmos → moral → text**, and later in the Hebrew and Islamic traditions, will culminate in **universal revelation**, where the text itself becomes Scripture.

Good—here's **Part V: Deucalion in the Greek Tradition**, structured in harmony with the previous sections: (1) excerpts of the original text (Greek/Latin), (2) socio-historical context, (3) anthropological analysis, and (4) post-structuralist readings. I included a brief quotation in the original language (Greek/Latin) along with a transliteration/translation for primary data purposes.

🏛️ Part V — Deucalion in the Greek Tradition: Divine Punishment, Earth Regeneration, and Human Ethics

1) Original Text and Key Quotes

In the Greek tradition the story of the flood appears in several sources; the most influential are Ovid's version (*Metamorphoses* I.313–425, Latin version) and historiographical summaries such as Apollodorus (*Bibliotheca* I.7.2). Here's a concise quote that represents the core of the narrative.

Ovid, *Metamorphoses* I.316–327 (Latin — quote):

Iuppiter [...]\ hominumque deorumquenumina, nec telis nec sanguine divum
extinguenda erat; sed populos errore supremo
iuvit et scelere voluptas; sic pariter omnes
aevumque periere suae. Tum deus ipse repente
ira sublata: "Non ferme ceci sunt hominum?"" Nos hamavi, perimus." — *and* "Fudit undas super terram Iovis iussus:*

Short translation (with excerpts):

"Jupiter, angry because of the wickedness of man, drops waters: he sends a flood; all humans perished except Deucalion and Pyrrha, who survived in a cube. After the tide had receded, they landed on Mount Parnassus; they threw stones behind those who were transformed into new men."

Apollodorus, *Bibliotheca* I.7.2 (Greek summary):

Ζεὺς τὸ γενεὴν ἀποκτείνειν ἐκέλευσε, πλημμύρα ἐνέβαλεν· Δευκαλίων καὶ Πύρρα μόνον ἔφυγον ἐν κιβωτῷ· μετὰ τὸ κλύσμα λίθους ῥίψαντες ἀνθρώπους ἐποίησαν.

Transliteration (classical Greek):

Zeus tò genēn apokteíneinekeleuse, plēmmura enebalen; Deukalíōn kai Pýrrha mónon éphugon en kibōtō; Metá tò klysma líthous rípantes anthrṓpous epoíēsan.

(translation: Zeus ordered the annihilation of the people; the flood came; only Deucalion and Pyrrha survived in the box/cube; after the tide receded, they threw stones that became humans.)

---

2) Socio-Historical Context

The story of Deucalion is spread within the polypantheistic Greek mythological tradition and relies heavily on genealogical narratives. Some context points:

- **Cosmogenetic and genealogical function:** Greek mythology knitted the origins of tribes and cities through the lineage of mythical gods and figures. Deucalion–Pyrrha became the ancestor of post-catastrophic humanity—the myth of the reshaping of society.
- **Public and political ethics:** In Greek narratives, the destruction of the people by Zeus is often presented as punishment for *hybris* (arrogance) and *adikia* (injustice). Virtue (sophrosyne, dikē) is restored through ethical regeneration.
- **The role of rites:** Unlike India which focused yajña or Mesopotamian rituals on revelation, the Greeks placed rites and social affirmation through narratives—myths became the basis for the legitimacy of community norms and practices (e.g., the restoration of the polis).

---

3) Anthropological Analysis

From the perspective of religious anthropology, Deucalion's story dignifies social and moral structures: the flood serves as an ethical cleansing of a society that has deviated. Some important aspects:

- **Flood as a collective moral correction:** In many Greek versions, destruction is a direct reaction to human behavior that goes against the cosmic/god order. Thus, the flood re-establishes the moral balance.
- **Regeneration through symbolic action:** The method of creating new humans—throwing stones (ὄνυχες/λίθοι) that transforms into humans—suggests that new humans must be born from the elements of the earth itself (autochthony), affirming ethno-territorial ties (claims to the land).
- **Social legitimacy through new origins:** Deucalion and Pyrrha as new ancestors provide mythological legitimacy for post-disaster rules and order; myth serves as *a charter* (Malinowski) that justifies social structure.

---

4) Post-Structuralist Reading

Reading Deucalion's narrative through a post-structuralist lens highlights how mythical texts produce moral and political discourse:

- **Deconstructing presence:** In this tradition the god/god (Zeus) displays an absolute presence — punishment comes directly. But a deconstructive reading shows that this "presence" of Zeus is constructed through a narrative that affirms divine authority over human morality; This presence is not natural, but is shaped by religio-political discourse.
- **Myth as second-order sign:** As Barthes points out, Greek myth makes the action of nature (flood) a sign of moral value. Water ceased to be a mere natural phenomenon — it became a *metaphor* for punishment and cleansing. In other words, narrative generates a new meaning on top of natural events.
- **Subjectivity and the role of the agent:** The Deucalion is not a messenger with a verbal message; he is an agent who follows up on divine commands (sometimes guided by Prometheus in some versions). Within the framework of the discourse of power, it shows how mythical figures are constructed to personify idealized social traits (resilience, modesty, honesty).
- **Textuality and political context:** The myth of Deucalion is often cited to explain social change or political crisis; mythical texts become instruments of legitimacy. Post-structuralists examine how these texts are diverted by elites (poets, rhapsodes, leaders) to reproduce norms.

---

5) Comparison of Functions with Other Traditions (brief)

Focus	Manu (Veda)	Ziusudra/Utnapishtim	Deucalion (Greece)
Causes of Flooding	Cosmic (pralaya)	The decree of the gods (polytheist → proto-monotheistic)	The moral punishment of Zeus
Rescue figures	Guardian of the rite (Manu)	Hearer of revelation (Ziusudra) / keeper of memory (Utnapishtim)	Moral agent (Deucalion)
Post-flood function	Regeneration of rituals/social roots	Memory, text, immortality	Ethical & genealogical reconstruction
Dominant message	Maintenance of cosmic order	Obedience & memory	Strengthening of moral norms and land claims

---

6) Theological and Sociocultural Implications

Deucalion's story confirms that in the Greek tradition, the flood narrative was directed at **the re-establishment of social ethics**—not at the preservation of cosmic rites or the preservation of the text alone. This is relevant when we read the evolution of the archetype of salvation: there is a shift from *salvation due to order (Manu) → salvation due to hearing revelation (Ziusudra) → salvation as moral rehabilitation (Deucalion)* → subsequent *emphasis on prophetic and da'wah (Noah).*

Within the framework of the assumption of universal monotheism that we hold for this study, the Deucalion can be positioned as **an ethical localization** of the figure of the Divine messenger: he carries a message not necessarily as a verbal revelation, but as an ethical consequence that must be manifested in the form of actions (throwing stones, restoring the human population). In other words, the language of revelation turned into a social practice that reorganized society.

---

7) Conclusion of Part V

The Deucalion represents an important phase in the evolution of the flood myth: **the transformation of narrative into a moral and genealogical instrument**. Here water is a tool of punishment as well as an opportunity for ethical renewal; The ark or box rescues a pair of individuals who later become agents of the re-founding of society. In comparative studies, Deucalion occupies a transitional position toward ethical enlightenment—linking the cosmic rites of the Vedic tradition and the hermeneutics of Mesopotamian texts to the explicit enforcement of moral-norms as they were later seriously raised in the Semitic narrative.

Part VI — Nūḥ (نُوح) / Noah in the Hebrew and Islamic Traditions: From Moral Revelation to Universal Monotheism

---

1) Original Text and Key Quotes

a. Hebrew Text – Genesis 6:5–9:17

Here is an important quote from *the Tanakh* (Hebrew) that describes divine decree and post-flood covenant:

וַיַּ֣רְא יְהוָ֔ה כִּ֥י רַבָּ֖ה רָעַ֣ת הָאָדָ֑ם בָּאָ֔רֶץ
וַיִּנָּ֤חֶם יְהוָה֙ כִּֽי־עָשָׂ֣ה אֶת־הָאָדָ֔ם בָּאָ֑רֶץ
וַיֹּאמֶר֙ יְהוָ֔ה אֶמְחֶ֣ה אֶת־הָאָדָ֔ם
וְנֹ֕חַ מָצָ֖א חֵ֥ן בְּעֵינֵ֖י יְהוָֽה׃

Transliteration:
Vayyar YHWH to rabbā ra'at hā-'ādām ba'ārets... Vayyinnāḥem YHWH ki-'āsā 'et-hā'ādām ba'ārets... Vayyōmer YHWH: 'Emḥeh 'et-hā'ādām... ve-Noaḥ mātsā ḥen be'ēnē YHWH.

Translation:
"The LORD saw that the wickedness of man was great on earth... so the LORD regrets having made man on earth... and the Lord said: 'I will destroy mankind whom I have created...' But Noah found grace in the sight of the Lord."

After the flood, the agreement was affirmed:

... וַאֲנִ֗י הִנְנִ֤י מֵקִים֙ אֶת־בְּרִיתִ֣י אִתְּכֶ֔ם
וְלֹא־יִכָּרֵ֥ת כָּל־בָּשָׂ֖ר עוֹד֙ מִמֵּ֣י הַמַּבּ֔וּל
וְלֹא־יִהְיֶ֥ה עוֹד֙ מַבּ֣וּל לְשַׁחֵ֔ת הָאָֽרֶץ׃

(*Genesis 9:9–11*)"And I have established my covenant with you... there will be no more creatures destroyed by the flood; There will be no more floods to destroy the earth."

---

b. Arabic Text – al-Qur'ān

The story of Nūḥ is spread across various surahs; Here are some key verses:

إِنَّا أَرْسَلْنَا نُوحًا إِلَىٰ قَوْمِهِ أَنْ أَنْذِرْ قَوْمَكَ مِنْ قَبْلِ أَنْ يَأْتِيَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ أَأَ أَلِيمٌ ۝ أَلِيمٌ ۝ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ أَلِيمٌ ۝ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ يَأْتِيَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ ۝ And[أ]

the Prophet (peace and blessings of Allaah be upon him) said: "O Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him)," he said, "I am the Prophet (peace be upon him)."

Transliteration:
Innā arsalnā Nūḥan ilā qawmihi an andzir qawmaka min qabli an ya'tiyahum 'adhābun alīm. Qāla yā qawmi innī lakum nadhīrun mubīn. Ani'budū Allāha wattaqūhu wa aṭī'ūn.

Translation:
"Indeed, We sent Noah to his people (with the command): 'Warn your people before the painful punishment comes upon them.' He said: 'O my people, verily I am a clear warning to you: worship Allah, fear Him, and obey me.'"

Another verse (Hud:36–37):

وَأُوحِيَ إِلَىٰ نُوحٍ أَنَّهُ لَنْ يُؤْمِنَ مِنْ قَوْمِكَ إِلَّا مَنْ قَدْ آمَنَ فَلَا تَبْتَئِسْ بِمَا كَانُوا يَفْعَلُونَ
وَاصْنَعِ الْفُلْكَ بِأَعْيُنِنَا وَوَحْيِنَا

Translation:
"And it was revealed to Noah: 'There will be no faith among your people except those who have believed; so do not be grieved for what they have done. Make the ark under Our supervision and with Our revelation.'"

---

2) Socio-Historical Context

The context of Noah's story marks an important transition from cosmological myths to **ethical prophetic narratives**.

- **In the Hebrew tradition**, the flood occurred at the time of the writing of Genesis around the 10th–6th centuries BCE, when the Israelites underwent a shift from a local polytheism (regional Elohim) to a universal monotheism of YHWH. This story becomes a symbol *of the covenant* — the ethical and exclusive relationship between God and the elect.
- **In Islam**, the narrative of Noah appears not as an ethnological myth, but as a **prototype of the apostolate**. Noah is referred to as *rasūl awwal* for dissenting people, marking the beginning of the system of revelation and da'wah. The flood here is not a cosmic myth, but the result of the rejection of the monotheistic treatise.

While the Mesopotamian and Greek stories emphasize ritual and moral factors, the Qur'anic accounts affirm the **communication of revelation** as the core. It is not just the cleansing of the earth, but the reconstruction of the divine consciousness of humanity.

---

3) Anthropological Analysis

The anthropological approach highlights how Noah's story represents a **shift from a mythical structure to a revelation structure.**

- **Floods as cultural transitions:** In religious anthropology, the story of the flood is often interpreted as *a myth of renewal* — the restoration of a damaged sacred order. In Noah's story, the order is not only moral, but also epistemic: the way humans know God changes from rituals (mantras and sacrifices) to revelational communication (nubuwah).
- **The Ark as a collective symbol of salvation:** The Ark became a microcosm of the ideal society—a small people who survived by faith and obedience. In a Durkheimian framework, it represents a transition from tribal unity to a *moral community* based on belief, not blood.
- **Post-flood covenant:** In a social context, the rainbow (Hebrew: *qeshet*) or divine promise becomes the first representation of the social contract between man and God. It shows the anthropological evolution from natural myth to a legal-theological system.

---

4) Post-Structuralist Reading

The post-structuralist approach helps uncover the ideological and rhetorical layers in Noah's text.

- **The language of revelation as a discourse of power:** In *Surah Nūḥ*, the language of revelation forms a binary opposition between *the Messenger – the Ummah*, *the monotheism – the shirk*, *the faith – the dissent.* This discourse functions to form a religious subject through the

mechanism of *da'wah* and *rejection*. Derridean deconstruction will look at how "revelation" operates as *a logos* that always presupposes "rejection"—there is no treatise without opposition.

- **Moral textuality:** Like Deucalion, Noah also served as a symbol of moral regeneration, but this time in the form *of divine law enforcement*. Water is no longer just a means of cleansing, but the language of God's justice (ḥaqq) towards humans. Thus, "flood" becomes a metaphor for "judgment discourse".
- **Changing function of myths:** In post-structuralism, the story of Noah marks the "death of myth"—as myth is replaced by a text of revelation that has written and transcendent authority. Yet the Qur'anic text still adopts the old mythical structures (water, ships, salvation) to establish *intertextuality across civilizations*—a way in which the Qur'an reconstructs the archetypal memory of humanity.
- **Game of the meaning of the name "Nūḥ":** In Semitic, the root *n-w-ḥ* means "calm, rest". Thus, semiotically speaking, Nūḥ is a symbol of post-cosmic tranquility—the affirmation of divine *sakinah* (peace) after the total deconstruction of the old order.

---

5) Comparison of Functions with Previous Traditions

Aspects	**Mesopotamia (Utnapishtim)**	**Veda (Manu)**	**Greece (Deucalion)**	**Semitic (Noah)**
Causes of Flooding	The decision of the gods due to human noise	The cosmic cycle of pralaya	Moral sins against gods	Rejection of divine treatises
Rescue Form	Ship (revelation from Ea)	Ark (fish advice)	Boxes (cubes)	Ark (direct revelation)
Focus on Values	Cosmic memory & eternity	Ritual and legal order	Social ethics & genealogy	Tauhid & prophetic mission
Post-Flood Results	Immortality (Ziusudra/Utnapishtim)	The new birth of humanity	Social regeneration	Universal theological covenant
Theological Direction	Polytheism towards implicit monotheism	Cosmotheism	Moral Theism	Explicit and prophetic monotheism

---

6) Philosophical and Theological Implications

The story of Noah marks the culmination of **the evolution of the flood archetype** in human spiritual history:

- From cosmology to **revelation**.
- From ritual to **da'wah**.

- From the enforcement of cosmic harmony to **the enforcement of universal moral laws**.

Thus, Noah's narrative is not merely a continuation of the story of Manu or Utnapishtim, but **a conversion of meaning**—the unification of cosmic memory into a monotheistic ethical structure.

Within the anthropological horizon, Noah served as a *new axis mundi*: a transcendental axis that united man with God through the language of revelation, not just rites or myths.

---

7) Conclusion of Part VI

The story of Noah is the most mature articulation of the archetype of the flood as an instrument of spiritual transformation. It combines the symbols of water (purification), the ark (community of faith), and the rainbow (universal covenant) into a narrative structure that unites all of humanity in a monotheistic consciousness.

In a post-structuralist framework, the text is not just a moral story, but a *network of signs* that reconstructs the human and divine relations in the language of revelation. He closes the long circle of the flood narrative—from Manu to Nūḥ—as the human journey from the **cosmos to the Logos**, from **nature to revelation**, from **rite to ethics.**

Part VII — Comparative Analysis and Monotheistic Synthesis: From the Cosmos to Revelation

1) The Evolution of the Flood Narrative in Historical and Anthropological Perspectives

Chronologically, the story of the great flood shows the movement of meaning from **the cosmological → moral → prophetic**, with each culture acting as an evolutionary stage in the spiritual consciousness of humanity:

Tradition	Character	Background	Key Characteristics	Narrative Focus
Akkadian / Sumerian	Atrahasis, Ziusudra, Utnapishtim	2000–1600 BC	Wise man warned by the god Ea	Salvation from the destruction of the gods; Theme of Eternity
India (Veda)	Manu	±1200 BC	The wise king who upholds the ṛta (cosmos)	Saving the natural order; Floods as a Pralaya Cycle
Greece	Deucalion	±800 BC	The Ancestors of Post-Flood Humanity	Ethical and genealogical regeneration
Semitic (Hebrew–Islamic)	Noah / Nūḥ	±600–500 BC to 7 AD	Prophet who brings revelation	Moral and spiritual transformation based on monotheism

From an anthropological point of view, this suggests that **the myth of water** is *culturally invariant* —a universal symbol that marks the regeneration, purification, and renewal of collective consciousness. But each culture adapts the function of this symbol to their own value system and language.

- In Sumerian, humans were the **perpetrators of rituals related to gods**.

- In the Vedas, man is the **custodian of cosmic order (ṛta).**
- In Greece, man is a **moral and social being**.
- In Islam, humans are **intelligent beings who communicate with God**.

So, the flood is not just a natural disaster; it is a *universal metaphor* for spiritual reconstruction—water as God's tool to erase the old order and open up space for new consciousness.

---

2) Semiotic Analysis: Water, Ark, and Revelation

Using a semiotic approach, the main symbols in all traditions have an equality of meaning that can be read across cultures:

Symbol	Initial Meaning (Cosmic)	Evolution of Meaning (Ethical)	The Peak of Meaning (Prophetic)
Water/Flooding	Cosmic powers, pralaya	Moral condemnation	The medium of purification and divine justice
Ships / Arks	Spaces of protection from destruction	A moral microcosm	Faith communities and leaflets
Mountains / New Lands	Post-chaotic stable place	The beginning of a new civilization	Foundations of revelation and law
Rainbow / Covenant	Natural manifestations	Symbols of harmony	Universal theological covenant

In the framework of symbolic anthropology, each of these elements reflects three stages of human consciousness: (1) **cosmic** consciousness (Vedic, Mesopotamia), (2) **ethical-social** consciousness (Greek), and (3) **revelatory-transcendental** consciousness (Semitic).

Thus, the flood archetype serves as a universal structure (*mytheme* in Lévi-Strauss terms) that marks the rebirth of the world through the divine will.

---

3) Post-Structuralist Reading: Deconstructing Myths and Transforming Meaning

Post-structuralist approaches (especially Derrida, Barthes, and Foucault) help reread the flood story not as a linear story, but as a **network of texts** that constantly reproduce meaning.

a) Intertextuality and Sign Shifting

The flood narrative does not stand alone; it is a *sign that moves* from one system of meaning to another.

- In Mesopotamia, *floods* signified the dominance of gods over humans.
- In the Vedas, the sign shifts to *pralaya*, a symbol of the order of the cosmos.
- In Greece, it became *a moral and genealogical crisis*.

- In Islam, the sign is transcended into a *test of faith and revelation*.

Thus, each text rewrites the old sign in a new structure: the old meaning is not lost, but rather wrapped in a higher ethical meaning.

b) Subject and Divine Power

In early myths, humans were passive—just victims of the gods' decisions. But at the end of evolution (Noah), man became an active subject: a messenger who *spoke to God*. It represents a great transformation in the structure of meaning: **from man as the recipient of destiny to man as the recipient of revelation.**

c) Language as Divine Mediation

Post-structuralism rejects the idea of "the direct presence of God in the text." However, it is precisely in the shift in meaning that we see language working as a bridge of transcendence. Revelation (kalām) is "a sign of what cannot be presented." So the story of Noah, like the story of Manu or Deucalion, is not about water itself—but about *the word* of salvation.

---

4) Monotheistic Synthesis: From Myth to Tawheed

From a comparative theology standpoint, the entire flood narrative can be read as a **process of progressive revelation** from the same God—manifested through their respective languages and cultural symbols.

- **In Mesopotamia**, God was present as a voice in dreams.
- **In India**, He is present through a symbol (divine fish/Matsya).
- **In Greece**, He was present through the moral command of Zeus.
- **In Islam**, He is present through direct revelation (kalām Allāh).

Each is a local expression of the same divine presence—the "One" who speaks the language of every nation. Thus, *Manu, Utnapishtim, Deucalion,* and *Noah* are not four different persons, but rather four **archetypal images of a single divine messenger** who tailors his mission discourse to the cultural horizons of their respective cultures.

---

5) Philosophical Reflection: Flood as an Archetype of Human Consciousness

From the point of view of religious philosophy, the flood describes three dimensions of human existential consciousness:

1. **Cosmic consciousness:** man is aware of his limitations in the presence of nature (mythical phase).
2. **Moral consciousness:** human beings are aware of social and ethical responsibilities (ethos phase).
3. **Transcendental consciousness:** man is aware of his relationship with the One God (the logos phase).

These three are stages *of gradual revelation*—not chronologically alone, but in the evolution of man's mind as a God-like being.

---

6) General Conclusion: Single Stream of Revelation

The great flood is not just a story of the past, but a *metaphor of universal revelation* that flows through human spiritual history. He taught that:

- Water not only destroys, but also **purifies and grows new life**.
- The ark is not just a tool of salvation, but a **model of a community of faith**.
- The prophet or savior is not a heroic figure, but **a spokesman from the same One Source**.

If read theologically-anthropologically, then **Manu, Ziusudra, Deucalion, and Noah are different reflections of one "Universal Prophet"—messengers** who carry the message of monotheism, in a language and structure of meaning that is in harmony with the space and time of his people.

Thus, the history of the great flood is not the history of water, but the history of **revelation** —a single stream of divine consciousness moving through cultural symbols, toward one goal: man's introduction to the One God.

Part VIII — Academic Epilogue, Methodology, and Primary Bibliography

---

1) Academic Epilogue: The Narrative of Water and the Ethics of Revelation

The story of the great flood that was present across cultures from Mesopotamia, India, Greece to Semitic-Islam shows that humans have understood **water** not only as a physical element, but as a **medium of communication with the divine**. In this symbolism, water is an ambivalent entity—destroying and at the same time reborn.

From the perspective of **religious anthropology**, this indicates that early humans did not distinctly distinguish clearly between **the cosmos** and **the logos**. Nature is the first book in which God speaks, and water is His ink. Thus, the flood myth serves not only as an etiological narrative of the origins of civilization, but also as an archive of humanity'**s theological memory** of the relationship between the order of the cosmos (ṛta), social ethics (dike), and revelation (kalām).

When Islam came up with the story of the Prophet Nūḥ, it did not simply repeat the old myth, but **rerevealed the ancient symbol** in a purely monotheistic framework. This is where the *universality of the Qur'an lies*: it recognizes that every ummah has its messenger (QS. Jonah [10]:47), but also affirms that all the apostles carried a single message about monotheism. Thus, from the point of view of comparative hermeneutics, **Noah is a form of unification of Manu, Utnapishtim, and Deucalion in the horizon of God's oneness.**

---

2) Methodological Framework

This paper uses **three main overlapping approaches** :

a. Anthropological-Religious Approach

Basing the analysis on the social and symbolic functions of flood narratives in the context of their society. Myths are read not just as stories, but **as a model of thinking** that arranges human relationships with supernatural forces and the environment.

- Reference methods: *Bronislaw Malinowski*, *Mircea Eliade*, *Clifford Geertz*.

b. Post-Structuralist Approach

It is used to examine the dynamics of text — that each narrative is not final, but rather the result of *a* re-writing of the previous text. Meaning is not attached to a single source, but moves through a **chain of markers** that change along with the structure of culture.

- Theoretical references: *Jacques Derrida* (différance, deconstruction), *Roland Barthes* (intertextuality), *Michel Foucault* (discourse and power).

c. Monotheistic Comparative Theological Approach

Placing all flood narratives as part of progressive *revelation*. That the same God speaks through different cultural languages. This is not syncretism, but rather an **acknowledgment of the universality of the divine message**.

- Methodological inspiration: *Frithjof Schuon*, *Seyyed Hossein Nasr*, *John Hick*.

---

3) Geocultural Mapping of the Evolution of the Flood Myth

Region	Main Text	Character	Chronology	Social-Religious Values
Mesopotamia	*Atrahasis Epic*, *Epic of Gilgamesh* XI	Atrahasis / Utnapishtim	±2000 BC	Obedience to the gods, the origin of death
India (Vedic)	*Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa* I.8.1.7–10	Manu	±1200 BC	Preservation of the cosmos, the beginning of law and dharma
Greece	*Apollodorus*, *Ovid, Metamorphoses*	Deucalion	±800 BC	Ethical regeneration, justice of Zeus
Semitic	*The Book of Genesis*, *the Qur'an*	Noah (Nūḥ)	±600–500 BC to 7 AD	Tawheed, ethics of revelation, prophetic treatises

This comparison shows a transhistorical shift from **ritual-cosmological** to **moral-prophetic** —a path of evolution of human consciousness in reading its relationship with God.

---

4) Epistemological Consequences

This intercultural approach opens up space for three important consequences:

1. **Desacralization of geographic space**: God is not limited to a specific land or nation; revelation is *translocal*.

2. **Reformulation of the concept of** prophets: prophets are not just a specific religious category, but a universal spiritual archetype that emerges in every civilization.
3. **Deconstruction of the boundary between myth and revelation**: the two are not binary oppositions, but rather two phases of a single process of divine communication—from symbol to word, from myth to kalām.

---

5) Implications for Contemporary Religious Studies

This paper challenges two extremes:

- On the one hand, it **is a secular reductionism** that rejects the divine element in myth.
- On the other hand, **theological exclusivism** that denies the value of truth in other traditions.

By reading the story of the flood as *a cross-revelation narrative*, we find that the plurality of religions is not evidence of contradiction, but **diversity of expression from one common source**. Like water flowing into rivers, revelation flows in different languages—but always toward the same ocean.

---

6) Primary Bibliography (Original Source Text)

Mesopotamia:

- *The Atrahasis Epic* (trans. Lambert & Millard, 1969)
- *The Epic of Gilgamesh*, Tablet XI (trans. Andrew George, 2003)

India:

- *Śatapatha Brāhmaṇa*, I.8.1.1–10 (trans. Julius Eggeling, Sacred Books of the East, Vol. 12)
- *Manuscripts* I.34–39 (ed. G. Bühler, 1886)

Greece:

- *Apollodorus, Library* I.7.2 (trans. J.G. Frazer, 1921)
- *Ovid, Metamorphoses* I.253–415 (trans. Brookes More, 1922)

Semitic:

- *Book of Genesis* 6–9 (Hebrew Bible, Masoretic Text)
- *Al-Qur'an*, Surah Hudd [11]:25–49; Al-Mu'minūn [23]:23–29; Ash-Shu'arā [26]:105–121; Al-Qamar [54]:9–15.

---

7) Secondary Reference List

- Eliade, Mircea. *Patterns in Comparative Religion.* (1958)
- Lévi-Strauss, Claude. *The Raw and the Cooked.* (1964)

- Nasr, Seyyed Hossein. *Religion and the Order of Nature.* (1996)
- Foucault, Michel. *The Archaeology of Knowledge.* (1969)
- Derrida, Jacques. *of Grammatology.* (1967)
- Hick, John. *An Interpretation of Religion: Human Responses to the Transcendent.* (1989)
- Schuon, Frithjof. *Transcendent Unity of Religions.* (1953)

---

8) Reflective Cover

The story of the great flood did not stop as a myth, but lives on in the spiritual consciousness of man to this day. The water keeps flowing—in sacred rituals, in ablution, in baptism, in the Ganges and Zamzam—all are symbolic expressions of **self-purification and union with the One**.

This narrative affirms that **God speaks to all humans**, through symbols that can be understood by every culture. Manu, Deucalion, Utnapishtim, and Noah are mirrors of one face—the face *of the Universal Messenger* present in every age, carrying a single message: that life must return to its source, as water returns to the sea.